

From: CMitch0847@aol.com
To: [SR 520 DEIS Comments](#);
CC:
Subject: I support the Pacific Street Interchange option for SR 520
Date: Tuesday, October 10, 2006 12:07:35 AM
Attachments:

I-0536-001 | Of the three options put forth, There is only one that fills the minimum requirements, that is the Pacific Street interchange.

I want to comment on three specific areas.

I-0536-002 | First, I would like to acknowledge the Wsdot project team for their ability to change directions and put forth as the best option, someone else's idea. To do this required individuals that were truly committed to producing the best project and had a handle on their egos. This team deserves to be recognized for that effort.

I-0536-003 | Secondly some salesmanship by our leaders needs to be accomplished starting immediately. After visiting The phoenix area and observing close hand the "rubberized asphalt" applied to the "beltway" around the Phoenix metro area I am for utilizing this concept. I attended the public hearing and listened to people talk about their individual interests, basically they were against all of the three plans put forth. There supposedly is a test in the Seattle area for this quiet surface. Sell this to the public, it will work or it wont. The test areas should be immediately started on 520; one on the eastside at Yarrow Point and one on the ramp to I5. Put some of the nay sayers in charge of the reporting back the noise to the project team ie the public. If this works and the testing of the product is successful and meets standards, it could drastically affect the design especially of a lid structure, and would quiet those many individuals claiming a new 520 would make their homes unliveable with all the traffic(the build it and they will come theory). After observing the acul road in Arizona I am convinced that it will alter the design of the structure in a positive way.

I-0536-004 | Third, It seems reasonable that the project team reported early on that there has been some price escalation and the project will cost more than anticipated. Lets toll the bridge now; in 2007. Lets pay for the above tests of new materials. There seemed to be no end to people supporting the arboretum. They want to preserve a great public sanctuary and concept. Any increase in traffic seemed too much for the speakers. Why cant a toll be placed on the existing on ramp or route through

I-0536-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0536-002

Comment Summary:

Alternatives Development

Response:

See Section 1.1 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0536-003

Comment Summary:

Noise Walls

Response:

See Section 12.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0536-004

Comment Summary:

Early Tolling

Response:

See Section 3.3 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

I-0536-004 | the arboretum. Tolls have the tendency to govern traffic flows.. Our leaders, state and city, could change the laws or use their imagination. One possibility might be to allow the University of Wash to collect revenues to pay for the greater arboretum Master plans. Another make it a private road and let the UW set the amount and manage the number of vehicles that pass through the area.

I-0536-005 | I was disappointed that no one from the UW or Microsoft spoke at the public hearing held at Seattle Prep. It seems that the large institutions that pride themselves on the quantity and quality of their intellectual resources would be involved especially at this time in the project. My understanding is that UW has not been very active in this project .

Thank you for this opportunity

Charles T Mitchell
1843 East Shelby St
Seattle, WA 98112

I-0536-005

Comment Summary:

Coordination with Other Transportation Projects

Response:

See Section 1.0 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.